

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

BAHIA AMAWI,

Plaintiff,

v.

PFLUGERVILLE INDEPENDENT  
SCHOOL DISTRICT and KEN PAXTON,  
*in his official capacity as Attorney General of Texas,*

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

1:18-CV-1091-RP

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant Ken Paxton's second motion for extension of time to respond to Plaintiff Bahia Amawi's motion for a preliminary injunction. (Dkt. 17). Defendant Paxton has also filed a motion to consolidate this case with *John Pluecker et al. v. Ken Paxton Attorney General et al.*, Case No. 1:18-CV-1100-RP (W.D. Tex., Austin Division) (*Pluecker*), filed two days after Amawi brought the above-styled action. (Dkt. 14). Amawi opposes both motions.

This Order concerns only the second motion for extension of time. (Dkt. 17). In that motion, Defendant Paxton requests that the Court extend his time to respond to Amawi's motion for a preliminary injunction to January 18, 2019, because he intends to file an omnibus response to both Amawi's motion for a preliminary injunction and the motion for a preliminary injunction filed in the *Pluecker* case. Defendant Paxton wishes to consolidate these two cases and file an omnibus response because doing so "would be in the interest of judicial economy and most efficient for the parties." (*Id.* at 2). Amawi opposes the motion on grounds that any further delay in resolving her motion for a preliminary injunction "prolong[s] her unemployment and unreasonably extend[s] the duration of her First Amendment injuries." (Resp., Dkt. 19, at 2).

The Court is mindful that both parties wish to resolve this dispute as expeditiously as possible. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), the court may, for good cause, extend a party's time to take a required action. The omnibus response Defendant Paxton intends to file and for which he requests a second extension of time addresses the preliminary injunction motion in this case and the one in *Pluecker*, but the motion for consolidating those two cases may not be fully briefed until the week of January 21, 2019. To facilitate the efficient adjudication of this dispute, the Court will grant in part Defendant Paxton's second motion for extension of time, (Dkt. 17), and order expedited briefing on the motion for consolidation, (Dkt. 14).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant Paxton's second motion for extension of time, (Dkt. 17), is **GRANTED IN PART**. Defendant Paxton's response to Amawi's motion for preliminary injunction, (Dkt. 8), is due on or before **January 15, 2019**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Amawi's response to Defendant Paxton's motion for consolidation, (Dkt. 14), is due on or before **January 11, 2019**. Defendant Paxton's reply to Amawi's response, if any, is due on or before **January 15, 2019**.

**SIGNED** on January 9, 2019.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Robert Pitman", written over a horizontal line.

ROBERT PITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE